



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

cen
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/752,898	01/06/2004	Brett J. Buchanan	BBUCP101USA	5093
57608	7590	01/08/2008		
ERIC D. JORGENSEN 1457 KING ROAD HINCKLEY, OH 44233			EXAMINER LEFF, STEVEN N	
			ART UNIT 1794	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/08/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/752,898

Applicant(s)

BUCHANAN, BRETT J.

Examiner

Steven Leff

Art Unit

1794

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 November 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5-13,15-19,21-23 and 25-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5-13,15-19,21-23 and 25-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

- Claims 1-2, 5-13, 15-19, 21-23 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The application does not appear to disclose the subject matter of claims 1, 10-13, 15-19, 21, 23 and 27, as applicant did not mention where in the specification support is found for the amendments.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- Claims 1-2, 5-13, 15-19, 21-23 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
 - The phrase “physically differentiated from” of claim 1 is rejected as it is unclear if the phrase is with respect to the edible material and shell being of different flow properties such as viscosity, with respect to different shapes, with a physical barrier there between, and/or with respect to different sizes.
 - The phrase “the toy is consumable in it’s entirety” of claim 1, and 10 is rejected as it is unclear if the phrase is with respect to the toy being a small size which thereby allows it to be consumed in a single bite, or is with respect to all of the components which make up the toy being of edible material.

- Further with respect to claim 1, the phrase “prolonged motion of the toy when the toy is set in motion” is rejected as the phrase “prolonged motion” is a relative phrase, which renders the claim indefinite. The term “prolonged motion” is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. It is unclear as to what is encompassed by the phrase “prolonged motion of the toy when the toy is set in motion”; it is unclear as to what degree of difference is encompassed by this phrase, if not “prolonged motion of the toy when the toy is set in motion” but merely motion.
- The phrase “edible cat toy which comprises an outside shell for oral interaction with the cat, where the shell is made of an outer edible material, and catnip for stimulation of the cat to interact therewith” of claim 10 is rejected as it is unclear if the shell consists of two different layers, with the catnip being covered by an “outer edible material”, or if the phrase is with respect to the outer shell itself being comprised of a mixture of edible materials and catnip thus forming a single layered “shell”.
- Further with respect to claim 10, the phrase “an inner edible material surrounded by the shell that is accessible by the cat based on wear of the shell by the cat over an extended period of time” is rejected as the phrase “based on wear over an extended period of time” is a relative phrase, which renders the claim indefinite. The term “an extended period of time” is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. It is unclear as to what is encompassed by the phrase “an extended period of time”; it is unclear as to what degree of difference is encompassed by this phrase, if not “an extended period of time”.
- Claim 10 is rejected due to the phrase “made of different edible components” with respect to the inner edible material, as it is unclear if the different edible components is with regard to the inclusion of multiple different edible ingredients, or if the phrase is with respect to different edible components from the “outside shell material” which is made of “edible material”.
- Claims 15-16 are rejected as the claims teach that “the shell includes one or more holes” and that “the shell is flexible such that distortion causes the inner material to be released”, as the phrases appear to conflict with independent claim 10 from which they depend. For

example, neither method of releasing would require “wear over an extended period of time” as the holes of claim 15, and the flexible material of claim 16 allow for the inner material to be accessed without the required limitation of claim 10 where “an inner edible material surrounded by the shell that is accessible by the cat based on wear of the shell by the cat over an extended period of time”.

- Claim 17 is rejected as the claim teaches that “the shell is refillable with the inner edible material”, which appears to conflict with independent claim 10 from which it depends. For example, claim 10 requires the inner material being accessible due to “wear over an extended period of time” however claim 17 teaches that “the shell is refillable with the inner edible material” where the shell of claim 17 would already been exposed to “wear over an extended period of time” and thus when refilled the shell of claim 17 would not be capable of meeting the claim limitation of claim 10 which requires “an inner edible material surrounded by the shell that is accessible by the cat based on wear of the shell by the cat over an extended period of time”.
- Claim 18 is rejected due to the phrase “the inner edible material” as it lacks antecedent basis, as claim 10 teaches the inner material being “made of different edible components and catnip”, however claim 18 is directed to a single “edible material” and thus it is unclear if the phrase is with respect to a only catnip, only one ingredient, or if all the different edible components and catnip are to be taken as the edible material.
- Claim 18 is rejected due to the phrase “the inner and outer edible materials together form a single contiguous composition” as it is unclear if the phrase is with respect to the inner and outer edible materials are layered back to back with no other layers, or if the phrase is with respect to the inner and outer edible materials being mixed together, and formed thus forming a single contiguous composition, or if the phrase is with respect to only the shell being of the single composition where the inner and outer edible material are with respect to the inner and outer surfaces of the shell itself.
- Claim 21 is rejected due to the phrase “homogeneous mixture of an inducement, and at least one of a nutrient, or a treatment” due to the fact that it is unclear if the phrase “homogeneous mixture” is with regard to a “homogeneous mixture” which contains different components but defined amounts such as cat food, or with respect to a single component.

- Claim 21 is rejected due to the phrase “homogeneous mixture of an inducement, and at least one of a nutrient, or a treatment” due to the fact that the phrase appears to conflict with itself as it is unclear how a “homogeneous mixture” can have different components.
- The phrase “the shell is made entirely of the edible material” of claim 27 is rejected as it is unclear if the “edible material” is with respect to the provided edible material or with respect to the edible material which is formed due to “mixing the edible material into a homogeneous mixture of an inducement, and at least one of a nutrient, or a treatment”.
- The phrase “the shell” of claim 27 is rejected as it lacks antecedent basis and thus it is unclear if “the shell” is with respect to outside of the inner edible material, or with respect to the “outer shell” which houses the inner edible material.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- Claims 1-2, 5, 8, 10, 11-13, 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brekau (DE 29703253) in view of Smith (1022113).

With respect to claims 1-2, 5, 8, 10, 11-13, 17-19, Brekau teaches an edible toy for an animal which comprises a shell that is for oral interaction with the animal (pg. 2 lines 5-7), and edible material which is surrounded by the shell (pg. 2 line 6). The edible material which is surrounded by the shell (pg. 2 line 6), and physically differentiated

there from (pg. 2 line 5-7), is accessible by the animal over an extended period of time (pg. 2 lines 19-20), where the toy is consumable in its entirety (pg. 2 line 15). Further, Brekau teaches that the shape of the shell facilitates stimulation of a cat to interact therewith by prolonged motion of the toy when the toy is set in motion (pg. 2 lines 6-7) and that the edible material facilitates stimulation of a cat to interact therewith (pg. 2 lines 3-4). Further, Brekau teaches that the edible material is accessed by the cat biting the shell (pg. 2 lines 3-4). Brekau further teaches that the shell includes an edible nodule (pg. 2 lines 15-16).

Brekau further teaches an edible toy for a cat which comprises an outside shell for oral interaction with the cat (pg. 2 line 15+) the shell made of an outer edible material (pg. 2 line 15+) for stimulation of the cat to interact therewith (pg. 2 line 15+), and an inner edible material accessible by the cat based on wear of the shell by the cat over an extended period of time (pg. 2 line 19+), where the inner edible material is made of different edible components (pg. 2 line 6+) thereby the entire toy is of edible material and thus consumable in its entirety (pg. 2 line 15+). Brekau further teaches that the inner edible material in the form of at least one of a liquid, a gel, a paste, or one or more edible objects (pg. 2 line 15+) where the inner edible material moves freely within the shell (pg 2 line 5+), and that the shell is refillable (pg. 2 line 5+).

However, Brekau does not teach that the shell and the inner edible material both contain catnip.

With respect to claims 1-2, 5, 10, 18, and 19, Smith teach an edible toy for an animal which comprises a shell that is for oral interaction with the animal (pg. 1, col. 2 line 79+), where the shape of the shell facilitates stimulation of a cat to interact therewith by prolonged motion of the toy when the toy is set in motion (pg. 2 col. 1 line 6+) that the toy includes catnip either wholly or partly (pg. 1 col. 1 lines 34-35).

Therefore although Brekau does not teach that the shell and the inner edible material contain catnip Brekau does teach a cat toy which is completely edible, and where Smith teaches an edible cat toy which contains catnip within both the shell and the inner edible material, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Brekau, and Smith and produced cat toy which is completely

edible and further includes catnip within the shell and the interior thereof in order to provide a cat toy which is not only entertaining due to shape, but further maintains the attention of the toy for an extended period of time due to the fact that the toy comprises catnip throughout where catnip is a known attractant to cats, thereby producing a more desirable product since the product contains both a sound and scent attractant.

Therefore since Brekau teaches a completely edible starch product with an edible inner material, and since Smith teaches providing catnip within the shell as a part of the inner edible material (pg. 1 line 49+), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to teach that the shell and the inner edible material contain catnip due to the fact that the addition of an edible component to an edible base would provide the predictable results of being more enticing to the cat, as is taught by Smith. In addition, since catnip is known in the art as an attractant to cats, MPEP 2144.07 states that the selection of a known material based on its suitability for its intended use supports a prima facie obviousness determination.

With respect to claims 11, 18 and 19 Brekau does not teach that the shell is formed of two mating pieces, that are permanently bonded together to enclose the inner edible material, or forming a single contiguous composition of the inner and outer edible material using an edible binding material, Brekau does teach two mating pieces that are bonded together to enclose the inner edible material, (pg. 1 line 9+), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to have taught two mating pieces that are permanently bonded together to enclose the inner edible material, since Brekau teaches two mating pieces that are bonded together to enclose the inner edible material, (col. 1 line 14) where providing a permanent bond would preclude the toy from opening and providing the reward from within prior to an adequate amount of play time being experienced. Further since Smith et al. positively teaches two mating pieces forming a single contiguous composition of the inner and outer edible material that are permanently bonded together to enclose the inner edible material (col. 2 lines 64-68) in addition to using an edible binding material for its art recognized and applicant's intended purpose of providing an edible toy of multiple different components which can be provided in a one-piece mass, as is taught by Smith et al. thereby allowing the toy to be molded into any desired shape (col. 2 lines 64-68) since

the edible binding gives body to the toy (col. 1 line 53-55). It would have further been obvious since MPEP 2144.07 states that the selection of a known process based on its suitability for its intended use supports a prima facie obviousness determination.

- Claims 6-7, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brekau (DE 29703253) in view of Smith (1022113) in further view of Fisher (4260635).

With respect to claim 6-7, and 9 Brekau and Smith are taken as above, however both are silent with respect to the shell surrounding multiple different layers which are formed concentrically about a core material or that the shell is compressed to a compression parameter for a particular animal such that a lower compression parameter facilitates easier access to the edible material and a higher compression parameter facilitates more difficult access to the edible material.

Fisher teaches a unitized animal food system (abstract). More specifically Fisher teaches a multilayered edible pet treat (col. 2 line 65+) where the compression parameter is chosen based upon a desired chew-resistance (col. 6 line 30, col. 2 lines 50-59).

Therefore, although Smith does not teach the shell surrounding multiple different layers which are formed concentrically about a core material Smith does teach an edible core material where the exterior of the core is painted or otherwise coated (col. 2 line 92+) where Brekau also teaches a two layer system (figs. 1-4). Therefore since Fisher does teach a core material which can be coated by more than one coating, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to have combine the teaching of Smith and Fisher and taught that the shell surrounds multiple different layers which are formed concentrically about a core material since both Smith and Fisher teach the desire to provide a method of coating a core where providing a multilayered treat as opposed to a single layered treat would allow for the product to contain more than merely food layers as is taught by Fisher (col. 3 line 53+). It would have further been obvious since MPEP 2144.04 IV (A) states that "mere scaling up of a prior art process capable of being scaled up, if such were the case, would not establish patentability in a claim to an old process so scaled" where in the instant case providing a multilayer structure as opposed to a single layer structure would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant.

- Claims 15-16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brekau (DE 29703253) in view of Smith (1022113) and in further view of Lindgren (5965182).

Brekau and Smith are taken as above however both are silent with respect to the fact that the shell includes one or more holes for releasing the inner edible material there through and that the shell is flexible such that distortion thereof by the cat causes the inner edible material to be released to the cat.

Lindgren teaches an animal chew toy. More specifically Lindgren teaches that the shell includes one or more holes for releasing the inner edible material there through (fig. 1c ref. #11) and that the shell is flexible such that distortion thereof by the cat causes the inner edible material to be released to the cat (abstract).

Therefore although Brekau does not teach that the shell and the inner edible material contain catnip Brekau does teach a cat toy which is completely edible, where Smith teaches an edible cat toy which contains catnip within both the shell and the inner edible material, where Smith further teaches a flexible shell (pg. 2 line 67+) and where Lindgren specifically teaches the flexible shell for its art recognized and applicant's intended purpose of causing the inner edible material to be released to the cat, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Brekau, Smith and Lindgren and produced cat toy which is completely edible, includes catnip within the shell and the interior thereof in order to provide a cat toy which is more entertaining due to the fact that the shell is flexible and thus may be bitten thereby producing a more desirable product.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to teach that the shell is flexible such that distortion thereof by the cat causes the inner edible material to be released to the cat since Brekau teaches a completely edible starch product with an edible inner material, since Smith teaches a flexible shell material, and further since Lindgren specifically teaches that the shell is flexible such that distortion thereof by the cat causes the inner edible material to be released to the cat thereby providing

- Claims 21-23, 25, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brekau (DE 29703253) in view of Kealy (3930031).

With respect to claim 21-23, 25, and 27, Brekau teaches providing an edible material (pg. 2 line 6+), forming an outer shell for housing the edible material (fig. 2, pg. 2 line 15+) and enclosing the edible material within the outer shell. Brekau further teaches compressing the shell and the edible material to a compression parameter that allows the cat to access the edible material via at least one of licking, biting, or clawing (pg. 2 line 18+), that the shell includes a hole such that the edible material can be replaced there through (fig. 2) and that the shell is made entirely of the edible component (fig. 2, pg. 2 line 15+).

Brekau does not specifically teach the edible material comprising at least one of an inducement, a nutrient, or a treatment that the edible material includes catnip or that the entire toy includes catnip, or that the mixture of edible components exhibits a marbling effect.

Kealy teaches a cat food composition (abstract). More specifically Kealy teaches mixing edible material into a homogeneous mixture of an inducement and at least one of a nutrient or a treatment (example 1) exhibiting a marbling effect (example 1), as Kealy teaches different amount with respect to the different components.

Therefore although Brekau does not teach mixing the edible material into a homogeneous mixture of an inducement and at least one of a nutrient or a treatment, Brekau does teach an edible encasement (pg. 2 line 15+) which is filled with cat food, and where Kealy teaches mixing the edible material into a homogeneous mixture of an inducement and at least one of a nutrient or a treatment (example 1) it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to have combine the teaching of Brekau and Kealy and taught mixing the edible material into a homogeneous mixture of an inducement and at least one of a nutrient or a treatment (fig. 2, pg. 2 line 6+), since both teach the desire to provide an enticing edible material which contains different components, since Brekau teaches the use of cat food where it is noted that cat food contains inducements, such as smell and taste, and nutrients and/or treatments, such as vitamins, where it is further noted that cat food is produced with defined compositions which are readily repeatable and thus are taken as homogeneous

mixtures (fig. 2, pg. 2 line 6+) and since Kealy positively teaches mixing the edible material into a homogeneous mixture of an inducement and at least one of a nutrient or a treatment for it's art recognized and applicant's intended purpose of providing an edible material which is not only enticing from a flavor and smell standpoint, but which further provides the beneficial addition of nutrients and or treatments thereby further providing a nutritious and stimulating edible material.

- Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brekau (DE 29703253) in view of Kealy (3930031) in further view of Lindgren (5965182).

Brekau and Kealy are taken as above however both are silent with respect to the fact that the shell includes one or more holes for releasing the inner edible material there through.

Lindgren teaches an animal chew toy. More specifically Lindgren teaches that the shell includes one or more holes for releasing the inner edible material there through (fig. 1c ref. #11).

Therefore although Brekau does not teach that the shell includes one or more holes for releasing the inner edible material there through, Brekau does teach a cat toy which is completely edible, where Kealy teaches an inner edible material comprised of an inducement and nutrients, and where Lindgren specifically teaches that the shell includes one or more holes for releasing the inner edible material there through (fig. 1c ref. #11) for its art recognized and applicant's intended purpose of causing the inner edible material to be released to the cat, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Brekau, Kealy and Lindgren and produced a cat toy which is completely edible, and where the shell includes one or more holes for releasing the inner edible material there through (fig. 1c ref. #11) thereby providing a more entertaining toy due to the fact that the shell has holes and thus the edible material within can be not only seen but directly smelled by the cat, and refilled by the owner without opening the toy thereby producing a more desirable product.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to teach that the shell includes holes since Brekau teaches a completely edible starch product with an edible inner material where the shell

includes indentations and elevations (pg. 2 line 22), since Kealy teaches an inner edible material comprised of an inducement and nutrients, and further since Lindgren specifically teaches that the shell includes one or more holes for releasing the inner edible material there through (fig. 1c ref. #11) which allows the play value of the toy to be altered by changing the size and/or shape of the edible material (col. 5-6 line 65-3) therein in addition to the fact that the toy is capable of refilling without having to open the toy thereby producing a more desirable product.

Response to Arguments and Amendment

- With respect to applicant's argument regarding Brekau being silent with respect to the inclusion of catnip in the shell and the inner edible material are moot in view of the new rejection.
- Applicant's arguments with respect to Smith as applied to claims 21-23 and 25-27 are moot in view of the new rejection. With regard to applicant's assertion that Smith does not teach a completely edible toy due to the inclusion of wood pulp, paper pulp, it is noted that wood pulp and paper pulp, are edible since the cat may consume them without any deleterious effects. With respect to the glue, cement, or the like which applicant states causes Smith to teach away from a completely edible product, it is noted that these are taught by Smith as optional elements (pg. 1 line 71+).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven Leff whose telephone number is (571) 272-6527. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Callie Shosho can be reached at (571) 272-1123. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like


Application/Control Number:
10/752,898
Art Unit: 1794

Page 13

assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SL

58711
1/4/08


DREW BECKER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
1/3/08